

Some Comments on Michael Egan’s ‘Slurs, Nasal Rhymes and Amputations’

MacDonald P. Jackson

Slurs” is apt: Egan casts many on me. I am accused of duplicity, ineptness, ignorance, and almost every kind of deviousness, such as deliberately concealing evidence that tells against my conclusions. This is a strange way to conduct a scholarly argument. I’ll reply to a few of Egan’s more widely off-target remarks.

Rowley’s Hand in the MS

He says that the *Woodstock/1Richard II* manuscript “is not the holograph he [Jackson] assumes it to be” (p. 158), that my “case rests on the assumption that the manuscript is ... in the author’s hand” (p. 160), and refers to “the MS—which ... he [Jackson] believes to be a holograph” (p. 179). But I argue precisely the opposite (*ROMARD*, p. 69, first 8 lines)—that the manuscript is not holograph but scribal.

Partridge and Stratification

I’m accused (again) of ignoring, “in a most unsatisfactory and unscholarly way”, Partridge’s claims for “stratification” in the MS.

But I specifically demonstrate that the linguistic forms that Partridge calls “old-fashioned” persisted into the seventeenth-century, and were used frequently then, and so could well have belonged to a seventeenth-century composition (*ROMARD*, p. 73).

Elliott and Valenza

With regard to the research of Ward Elliott and Robert Valenza, Egan writes: “Jackson notes that Shakespeare fails their authorship test for *1 Richard II*, but keeps quiet about the fact that so does Samuel Rowley” (p. 166). This gets the matter the wrong way round and reveals a misunderstanding of Elliott and Valenza’s work. They show that plays of the acknowledged Shakespeare canon “pass” nearly all their tests for Shakespeare (that is, yield, for various features, figures falling within a normal Shakespearean range), whereas non-Shakespearean plays fail large numbers of tests. *Woodstock/1 Richard II* fails more of their tests than all but a very few of the many non-Shakespearean and doubtful plays they have investigated. It is markedly unShakespearean in these terms. Naturally, Rowley’s *When You See Me You Know Me* is too. Some of the Elliott–Valenza tests are open to criticism, but in combination the tests do a pretty good job of sorting Shakespearian from non-Shakespearean writing.



King Richard II

Revisions to the MS

Egan says (p. 168): “Jackson’s most important claim is that Shakespeare’s ‘mature’ style ‘is nowhere visible in the verse of *Woodstock*.’” (I have supplied some missing quotation marks.) “It’s a typically legalistic formulation”, Egan writes, “since my case is that the play is an early work”. However, the statement he quotes is part of a consideration of whether *Woodstock*/*Richard II* could have been revised by Shakespeare around 1605 (as well as originally composed by him around 1592-3) (Jackson, p. 94). Egan’s opinion is that *Woodstock*/*Richard II* “was composed in the early 1590s but revised ca. 1605, when it was recopied by a scribe who introduced abbreviations, especially ampersands and other elisions... Jacobean proclitics, enclitics, and other contractions...”. He now regards this revision as “very thorough” (p. 198). It is not clear how much of this seventeenth-century revision he thinks Shakespeare himself was responsible for (he wrote in his edition of Shakespeare having “touched it up” at this time). If Shakespeare was responsible for much of the revision, one would expect some clear signs of his “mature” seventeenth-century style. I claimed that there weren’t any—a judgment neither more nor less subjective than Egan’s that only Shakespeare could have written a speech by Anne a’ Beame that he quotes from I.iii (Egan, pp. 165-6). But at least my impression, not Egan’s, is shared by the majority of scholars.

New Historicism

I am accused of an “antipathy to historically informed analysis” (p. 199), because I corrected Egan’s labelling of me as a “New Historicist”. Does he not realize that it is possible to be “historically informed” without being indentified as a “New Historicist” critic? First Egan seemed to use the label as a kind of put-down: being a “New Historicist” somehow explained my inability (in his view) to get things right; now my not being a “New Historicist” explains my alleged shortcomings.

Shreds and Patches

Egan states that “according to Jackson... Samuel Rowley... made a ‘shred and patches’ quilt of his play from Shakespeare” (p. 160). I have never made such a claim. What I wrote in my original *MaRDiE* article is: “Shakespeare takes from the chronicles whatever bears most directly on the deposition and death of King Richard, with its consequences in the civil strife handled in *Henry IV*. Bolingbroke’s usurpation of the crown, and the execution of his rival, are the cataclysmic events of Richard’s reign, and Shakespeare focuses on their immediate causes. Arguably, the author of *Woodstock* builds his play out of the shreds and patches that remain, amalgamating circumstances and happenings widely separated in historical fact, and making a largely imaginary Thomas of Woodstock the centre of the struggle between the degenerate king’s uncles and various ‘minions and machiavels’ Instead of Richard’s murder, he gives us *Woodstock*’s” (Jackson 2002, p. 53). As must be obvious to any unbiased reader, I was arguing that, *Richard II* having dealt with the major event of Richard’s reign, the author of *Woodstock* was driven to base his play on the leftover, chronologically scattered incidents in the chronicles’ accounts of that reign.

The T Index

Egan (p. 163) finds evidence for Shakespeare’s, and against Rowley’s, authorship of *Woodstock*/*Richard II* in the “T indexes” of *Woodstock*/*Richard II*, Rowley’s *When You See Me*, and those of Shakespeare’s plays. The “T index” is a measure devised by Jonathan Hope, to whose *The Authorship of Shakespeare’s Plays* Egan gives a reference. It consists of the total number of “thou” forms of the second person pronoun (including “thee”, “thy”, “thine”, and contractions such as “th’art” for “thou art” and “th’ast” for “thou hast”), divided by the total number of lines

and multiplied by 100. Egan claims that the index for *Woodstock/1 Richard II* is 8.26 and that this is “right on target” for Shakespeare, whereas that for *When You See Me* is 3.5, so that Rowley’s play and the anonymous one “clearly issue from dissimilar linguistic minds”. His index for *Woodstock/1 Richard II* may well be right if based on the line numbering of his own edition. Basing the index on the total lines numbered in the Malone Society Reprint gives an index of 8.6 (to one decimal place, 9 to the nearest whole number, as in Hope’s figures). The correct index for *When You See Me*, again using Malone Society Reprint line numbering, is 10.8 (11 in Hope’s terms), very different from Egan’s wildly incorrect 3.5, and quite close to the index for *Woodstock/1 Richard II*: the fact that the *Woodstock/1 Richard II* index is a little lower is consistent with a slightly later date for *Woodstock*’s composition, if Rowley wrote both plays. Egan compares *Woodstock/1 Richard II*’s index with Hope’s 7 for *Hamlet* and *Coriolanus*, 8 for *Julius Caesar* and *Measure for Measure*, and 9 for *Othello*, *Macbeth*, and *All’s Well That Ends Well*. These are all plays of Shakespeare’s maturity, not early Shakespearean works as he considers *Woodstock/1 Richard II* to be. For Shakespeare’s history plays, Hope gives the following indexes: *2H6* 16, *3H6* 18, *1H6* 16, *R3* 14, *R2* 15, *Jn* 14, *1H4* 15, *2H4* 10, *H5* 8. There is a clear chronological decline in the indexes, both in Shakespeare’s histories as a genre and in his dramatic canon as a whole. It is not until *Henry V* (1598-9) that any history play has an index as low as that for *Woodstock/1 Richard II*. The “T index” evidence favours Rowley’s, rather than Shakespeare’s, authorship of *Woodstock/1 Richard II*.

Hendiadys

Egan appears to have no understanding of what constitutes hendiadys. Among his supposed examples from *Woodstock/1 Richard II* there is not one that clearly qualifies as true hendiadys. Nor does he appear to have any ear for early modern verse or to be familiar with the terminology of prosodic analysis.

Ants Oras

He has no firm grasp of the nature of Ants Oras’s work on pausation within early modern dramatic verse. He has the completely erroneous idea that Oras’s pauses marked by commas in the original texts are “in the jargon of his day, ‘feminine’ and those marked by “full-stops ... ‘masculine’” (p. 169). Oras never misuses the terms “feminine” and “masculine” in this way. Egan does not appreciate that Oras’s A-type pauses within verse lines include all pauses marked by any punctuation or a change of speakers, though I specifically stated as much. He quotes a line from the MS that reads “The Realmes of England. ffrance. and Ireland” and asks “Did Jackson count two periods or two commas? Perhaps one of each?” (p. 177) The answer is that in my counts of A-type pauses, the degree of heaviness of the punctuation was irrelevant: there are pauses marked after the fifth and sixth syllables and both were counted, as for all Oras’s own A-type figures. I offered no figures for Oras’s B-type pauses, marked by punctuation heavier than a comma.

Corbin and Sedge

Egan makes much of the elements of arbitrariness in the MS’s punctuation. But the pattern that produces twin (and almost equal) peaks of pausation after the fourth and sixth syllables in verse lines also emerges in modern editions. If Egan cannot hear that the verse is structured in this way, I cannot help him. I based my counts of Oras’s C-type pauses (created by the division of a line between speakers) in *Woodstock/1 Richard II* on the Revels edition by Corbin and Sedge. Egan implies that there is something improper about such a decision, and claims that “Scholarly integrity requires using the MS. alone”. But of course the MS, like printed texts of the time, does not

step speeches to indicate shared lines, so that working directly from the MS would have meant imposing my own editorial decisions. Using Corbin and Sedge's edition (chosen because it is the most recent and belongs to the highly respected Revels series) avoided this subjectivity. Naturally, modern editors differ in how they step lines, but competent ones, such as Rossiter and Corbin and Sedge show a fair measure of agreement. Egan's tables showing the practices of editors of *Woodstock/1 Richard II* make the differences seem much greater than in fact they are by including editors who never or hardly ever adopt the "stepping" convention. Egan also misunderstands Oras's principles of computation and the principles of verse analysis. His objections to my references to the "epic caesura", for example, simply reveal lack of knowledge. No experienced student of prosody would find so many of my remarks about specific shared lines problematical as to render his or her sense of the pausation patterns significantly different from mine.

Speech-Pause Rhymes

Egan makes heavy weather of my demonstration that the rhyming in *Woodstock/1 Richard II* is utterly unShakespearean. Frederic W. Ness's definition of "speech-pause" rhyme is perfectly clear (*The Use of Rhyme in Shakespeare's Plays*, 1941) and so is my account of it. The only play associated with Shakespeare in which it is used frequently is *Pericles*, where every instance falls within the first two acts, generally accepted as by George Wilkins. *Timon of Athens* is the Shakespeare play with the next highest number, but nearly all instances fall within passages that are now widely accepted as by Middleton. (See Brian Vickers, *Shakespeare, Co-Author* (2002) for a summary of the evidence for both plays.) Even so, the number of lines of speech-pause rhyme in *Woodstock/1 Richard II* (112) far exceeds that in *Timon* (20, at least 16 of which are Middleton's).

Egan accuses me of dishonestly "excluding *Pericles*, *Prince of Tyre* and *Timon of Athens*, nominally on the grounds of collaboration, but really because they're not helpful to the argument. "Jackson again manipulates his data", he writes, adding that the collaborative *1 Henry VI*, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, and *Henry VIII* are "helpfully retained" (p. 95). But since these last-mentioned three collaborations contain very few "speech-pause" rhymes, there would have been absolutely no point in singling them out for special discussion. The only facts relevant to my argument are that Shakespeare largely eschews "speech-pause" rhyme, though it is used by two of his collaborators, and that the author of *Woodstock/1 Richard II*, like Samuel Rowley, was very fond of it. If Egan is unaware of the evidence for collaboration in *Pericles* and *Timon of Athens*, he can easily repair his ignorance by reading Vickers's book.

Nor is there anything problematical about my identification of "near-rhymes" and instances of the subcategory "nasal near-rhymes". I counted these in exactly the same way as David J. Lake counted them in his excellent *Notes and Queries* articles on *Pericles* (described in my *Defining Shakespeare*, pp. 95-7). Another competent investigator might reject a small minority of my examples or add examples that I overlooked, but the prevalence of such rhymes must be obvious to anybody who examines the play impartially. And this prevalence is both unShakespearean and Rowleyan. Egan seems to have the bizarre idea that the nasal near-rhymes and other near-rhymes demand to be spoken as exact rhymes. Why, otherwise, would he write that the "alleged rhymes rest on impossibly distorted pronunciations ... that would turn any real-life performance into an adenoidal farce" (p. 192). Has he never been taught about "near-", "slant-", or "off-" rhyme? He even thinks that "again" is an "actual rhyme" with "uncertain" (p. 194). George Chapman sometimes "rhymed" a stressed with an unstressed syllable, but "again", even when pronounced to rhyme with "sane", ends in a different vowel from "uncertain", which ends with the indeterminate vowel (designated in standard international phonetic transcription by [ə]). Since Egan blames me

for using a modern edition for some of my analyses, it should be pointed out that had he himself used the MS here, he would have found that it spells the two words “agen” and “vncertayne”, and so does not offer even an “eye-rhyme”.

Note:

The articles of mine that I cite in this response are “Shakespeare’s *Richard II* and the Anonymous *Thomas of Woodstock*”, *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*, 14 (2002), 17-65; and “The Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*: Evidence and its Interpretation”, *Research Opportunities in Medieval and Renaissance Drama*, 46 (2007), 67-100.

Michael Egan Replies:

Slurs

Professor Jackson’s inflated terms—“duplicity, ineptness, ignorance, and almost every kind of deviousness,”—are his own, not mine. I’m not uncritical of his methods and conclusions, of course, but everything is documented and politely referenced without adjectives in “Did Samuel Rowley Write *Thomas of Woodstock*?” and “Slurs, Nasal Rhymes and Amputations.”

Rowley’s Hand in the MS

It’s true that in his 2007 essay Jackson insists that the hand in the Egerton 1994 MS cannot possibly be Rowley’s. It “appears to be scribal...examples of Rowley’s handwriting exist and it is not that of the *Woodstock* manuscript...the handwriting of the *Woodstock* manuscript is not his,” etc.¹

Yet later we find him arguing that, on the contrary, the MS’s handwriting *is* Rowley’s, after all:

The *Woodstock* MS’s old-fashioned spelling of some nouns, verbs, adjectives, and so on is closely paralleled in Rowley’s own letters to Henslowe...One such link is closer than I had recognized. I mentioned Rowley’s curious use, in his letters to Henslowe, of capital *I/J* in mid-sentence *Jn*, *Js*, and *Jt* and linked this habit with the frequency in the *Woodstock* manuscript of initial and even medial capital *I*. But I failed to notice that the specific *In*, *Is* and *It* all occur in *Woodstock*, when beginning neither sentences nor verse lines.²

The MS writer thus must have been Rowley, since both share “the curious use” of “capital *I/J* in mid-sentence *Jn*, *Js* and *Jt*...old-fashioned spellings...and the frequency of initial and even medial capital *I*,” etc. All these “close parallels” constitute “a closer link than [Jackson] had recognized.”

I took this to be his final position since it’s in the later portion of his article and offered with a sense of excitement and discovery (“One such link is closer than I had recognized,” etc.). If Jackson now wants to qualify or withdraw the claim, he should do so, and also clarify whether he thinks the MS is a copy or holograph.

Partridge and Stratification

Jackson claims that by “demonstrating” that some sixteenth-century usages persisted into the seventeenth he has answered Partridge’s meticulously documented case for orthographic layering, that is, for the play as a Jacobean copy of an Elizabethan original. But he hasn’t even scratched the surface.

Of course some of the manuscript’s 16th-century “linguistic forms” persisted into the seventeenth. I grant it, Partridge grants it, everyone grants it—obviously words don’t die when cen-

turies change, though their meanings may evolve. Indeed, the MS's disparate verbal forms are the whole point and basis for Partridge's inquiry. He shows repeatedly that the orthography contains a variety of contradictory features, some indicating the 1590s, others redolent of the 1610s. His completely objective and evidence-based conclusion, and indeed that of every scholar who has actually examined the manuscript—which does not include Professor Jackson—is that it is a reworking with production notes, i.e., a prompter's version of a play written about 1592 and copied 12-15 years later by a scribe who introduced many of the usages (spellings, contractions, etc.) current in his day.

Jackson hedges his bets with the following uneasy disavowal:

I did not claim that all the words I listed could not have been used by a playwright in the early 1590s, merely that *Woodstock* contains many words that first came into theatrical vogue in the plays of the seventeenth century or the very last years of the sixteenth, while seeming to be devoid of words associated exclusively or predominantly within plays of the earlier period.³

Jackson's opening phrase ("I did not claim that all the words I listed could not have been used by a playwright in the early 1590s,") ends the debate about the principal data included in his 2001 essay, because I aver no more than this too. All the words listed could have been used by a playwright in the early 1590s, and obviously were. Nor is it true that the play "seems to be devoid of words associated exclusively or predominantly within plays of the earlier period," as Jackson himself later demonstrates (see below).

The trouble here is that elsewhere in his two essays Jackson claims flatly that these data unequivocally establish *I Richard II's* 17th-century credentials. The crucial qualifying clauses, "could have been used by a playwright in the early 1590s," etc., get forgotten.

I show repeatedly, using Jackson's own evidence and that of other stylometricians, the extent to which the play's usages are consistent with Shakespeare's early Histories. One might add that a rich, innovative vocabulary would not be remarkable if our author were indeed Shakespeare.

At one point in his 2007 essay Jackson maintains that Sam Rowley must have been "as it were" a "slow developer," behind the times with his antique spellings, out-dated "linguistic forms," archaic rhythmic choices and other anachronistic habits. This is Jackson's way of accounting for a Jacobean MS whose language is full of Elizabethanisms. In reality it is the other way around, but rather than accept the obvious, with all its supporting evidence (none of which he refutes), Jackson concocts a writer who "must have been" culturally backward. Yet here slow-developing Rowley is suddenly brilliantly *au courant*, employing "many words that first came into theatrical vogue in the plays of the seventeenth century or the very last years of the sixteenth."

The contradictions in Jackson's analysis likely derive from the fact that it is based not upon the MS but on Wilhelmina Frijlinck's diplomatic transcript published in the Malone Society Reprint series.⁴ This is a marvellous and indispensable text, but given the delicate and precise characteristics of the manuscript at issue here, obviously insufficient. The original alone will do. I realize it's a long way from Auckland to London just to examine an aging and hard-to-read folio, but that's what the scholarly situation requires. In many ways the debate about the manuscript's true nature—copy or holograph?—is no longer between Jackson and myself, but between Jackson and Partridge.

Jackson also forgets or chooses to overlook the fact that there is more to Partridge's stratification thesis than a few "old-fashioned" usages persisting from the 1590s into the early 1600s. Its foundation is the MS's assortment of apparently contradictory orthographic signals, among them "elisions, parentheses and use of the semicolon...colloquial and poetical contractions," verse

forms (with apheresis), proclitics and enclitics, the use of *has* and *does*, solecisms of concord “so common in plays before 1600,” irregular and often misplaced quirk words, revealing edits and corrections, the absence of adjectival forms ending in *-s*, and the employing of *them* (as opposed to 17th-century *'em*).⁵

Partridge notes that some of these usages are in mutual agreement while others are at odds with themselves and other aspects of the play. His dispassionate conclusion is that “the original composition belongs to the early nineties of the sixteenth century,” while the BL copy was made ca. 1607. Its Jacobean features were introduced by the copyist (not a scribe, by the way—there’s a professional distinction) working from an earlier version. The result is “stratification” or orthographic layering.

I don’t think it’s too harsh to describe Jackson’s waiving aside of this solid and well-grounded study as “unsatisfactory and unscholarly.” I point-blank challenge him to answer Partridge properly or concede his case.

Elliott and Valenza

Jackson makes too much of this. I was simply responding to his observation that in Claremont’s view *1 Richard II*’s author is not Shakespeare. But nor is it Rowley.⁶

Revisions to the MS

There are two separate questions here. The first is to what extent Shakespeare or anyone else revised the original play. We don’t entirely know, is the honest answer, though as I showed in my reproductions of the MS in “Slurs, Nasal Rhymes and Amputations,” the text’s many corrections, deletions, notes, additions and interpolations suggest revisions both major and minor from a variety of hands and for a variety of reasons. Some are obviously authorial, that is, by Shakespeare himself, others interpolations by successive generations of stage managers. Individual words are altered, inaccuracies corrected, whole speeches or scenes and segments removed or rewritten. A few major changes are structural, others display considerable sensitivity to the nuances of language, the requirements of historical accuracy and, significantly, an awareness of parallels in *2 Richard II*.

In other words, aspects of the play are revised in the light of its more famous successor. I spent a lot of time meticulously documenting all this and it’s frustrating that Jackson simply ignores the evidence. As with Partridge’s case for stratification, which these data obviously reinforce, Jackson again disputes the conclusion without responding to the evidence from which it flows.

The second question is whether Shakespeare’s “mature style” is represented in *1 Richard II*. The affirmative example I cited is the following speech, one among many:

Queen Anne: My sovereign lord, and you true English peers,
Your all-accomplish’d honors have so tied
My senses by a magical restraint
In the sweet spells of these your fair demeanors,
That I am bound and charm’d from what I was.
My native country I no more remember
But as a tale told in my infancy,
The greatest part forgot; and that which is,
Appears to England’s fair Elysium
Like brambles to the cedars, coarse to fine
Or like the wild grape to the fruitful vine.
And, having left the earth where I was bred,

And English made, let me be Englished.
 They best shall please me shall me English call.
 My heart, great King, to you; my love to all!

1 Richard II, I.iii.36-50

This is an instance of what Brean Hammond calls, in his edition of *Double Falsehood*, “continuous passages of Shakespeare that render his style easy to identify.”⁷ The statement is especially ironic in our context since in his review of Hammond Jackson accepts Shakespeare’s presence in this snatch from *Double Falsehood*:

What you can say is most unseasonable; what sing,
 Most absonant and harsh. Nay, your perfume,
 Which I smell hither, cheers not my sense
 Like our field-violet’s breath.

Double Falsehood, I.iii.53-6

His grounds for attribution are the “diverse Shakespearean characteristics” displayed.⁸ Yet not one of Shakespeare’s diverse characteristics is apparent to Jackson in Anne’s speech, not even “as a tale told in infancy, the greater part forgot.”

Jackson’s also wrong on at least two other counts. First, the quality of the writing here is not just a matter of opinion. In my article I analysed the speech at length, example after example demonstrating how its language, phrasing, poetic sophistication and thematic relationship with the rest of the drama, and also later Shakespeare, vividly display the Master’s characteristics.

Jackson’s response is that literary judgments are so subjective one is as good as another, yet elsewhere he concedes that *1 Richard II* is a better play than *When You See Me*. Let me challenge him again: Is there a difference in artistic quality between an Elmer Fudd cartoon and, shall we say, *Long Day’s Journey into Night*? If Jackson accepts that there is, which I’m sure he does, is that just his opinion? Or does he agree with Hamlet’s assessment of Elmer Fuddery, which

though it make the unskilful laugh, cannot but make the judicious grieve; the censure of the which one must in your allowance o’erweigh a whole theatre of others.

Hamlet, II.ii.25-8

Secondly, I again refer Jackson to my General Introduction and its section on the play’s critical reception. Volume III reprints key documents, many of which may surprise him. His preferred editors of the play, Corbin and Sedge, note that Shakespeare is “the one known dramatist in the 1590s whose dramatic style most closely resembles that of *Thomas of Woodstock*,” while Ian Robinson and Eric Sams, both distinguished critics, comment directly on Anne’s speech and unequivocally conclude that it is by Shakespeare. Robinson demands rhetorically, “Who else but Shakespeare writes like this?”⁹

Not Sam Rowley.

New Historicism

I noted Jackson’s “antipathy to historically informed analysis” because that’s what it is. It has nothing to do with his formal adherence to any particular school.

And yes, I do realize that it’s possible to be historically informed without being a New Historicist. I am myself such a person. The misunderstanding derives from the fact that Jackson concluded his 2001 essay with: “If we are to read it [*Woodstock*] in new historicist ways, we must

place it, for the first time, within its rightful context.”¹⁰ I took this as a statement of allegiance, apparently by mistake, and am happy to correct it.

However, my point is that New Historicist or not, Jackson fails to bring sufficient historical perspective to bear. So as a New Historicist he’s wanting, and as a not-New Historicist equally so, just as he says.

Shreds and Patches

Jackson identifies numerous “shreds and patches” from Shakespeare in *1 Richard II*, including a score and more of random quotes, speech fragments, characters and situations. His claim is that Rowley owes them all to the Bard, and I used the phrase in that sense. However, I withdraw it unequivocally because it’s not worth squabbling over—what’s important is that Jackson and I agree that there are many Shakespearean echoes in the play. Where we differ is accounting for the way they got there.

Accuracy of *1 Richard II*

What’s contestable about Jackson’s comments concerning the play’s use of history are three fundamental claims without which his entire edifice falls. The first is that Anon was left with the chaff of Richard II’s reign after Shakespeare made off with the wheat, that is, the story of the 1399 deposition. The second is that Anon amalgamated circumstances and happenings widely separated in historical fact, and the third, that Anon’s portrait of Woodstock is “largely imaginary.”

Once again I invite Jackson to examine the evidence set out at length in *The Tragedy of Richard II, Part One*. The play brilliantly and unexpectedly focuses on Richard II’s first deposition in December 1387, twelve years before Bullingbrook’s ultimate revolt, in order to make the case for what we now call constitutional monarchy. This is the source of the drama’s radicalism—originally it was a stand-alone work with a dangerously transformative political intent, way ahead of its time in the familiar Shakespearean way. The entire scope of Richard’s reign, excepting its tragic climax, comes in for historical treatment, and with the same set of familiar characters. There is the usual Shakespearean compression, scenic invention, and alteration of sequent events. Also familiar, despite these liberties, is that the narrative’s account of the period remains broadly accurate.¹¹

The same goes for the character of Woodstock. I’m perfectly aware that the critical-historical tradition underlying Jackson’s objection is that the actual duke was a turbulent and confrontational politician in no way resembling the sympathetic figure we encounter in *1* and *2 Richard II*. But that’s not entirely true. The claim is made only because most Shakespeare scholars, including Jackson, rarely examine historical sources other than Holinshed. But many available to Anon, and obviously used by him, describe a Duke of Gloucester “much beloved of the people” who mourned his departure to campaign in Prutzen land “as if the sunne had been taken from the earth.”¹² Holinshed acknowledges that he was “some-time rash in words,”¹³ too direct and frank, but adds significantly that he possessed “a faithfull hart.”¹⁴ In other words, he was not the traitor Richard later portrayed him as being.

Our dramatist clearly agrees, for he has loyal Woodstock himself say at one point, glancing ahead to history’s mistaken judgment:

Blank Charters call ye them? If any age
Keep but a record of this policy—
I phrase it too, too well, flat villainy—
Let me be chronicl’d Apostata,

Rebellious to my God and country both!

1 Richard II, III.ii.74-9

Other contemporary accounts suggest that the historical Woodstock was far from being the relentlessly contentious figure Jackson reflexively invokes. Walsingham reports that immediately prior to the crisis of 1387 he swore an oath of loyalty to the Crown before the Bishop of London, vowing never to cause dissension in the realm, and swore the same again, along with rest of the king's council, in February, 1392.¹⁵

Some chroniclers paint an almost appealing figure: *The Mirror for Magistrates* (1559) speaks of "syr Thomas of Wudstocke" as "a man muche mynding the common weale,"¹⁶ and Hardyng describes "the duke yt was ful clene," that is, honest and straightforward, unjustly "sent to Calyce secreately" and there "murthered."¹⁷ Grafton mourns "this honourable and good man miserable put to death"¹⁸ while Gower's *Cronica tripartita* (ca. 1400), a contemporary history, portrays Woodstock as both "well-meaning" and "honest."¹⁹ The connections with *2 Richard II*'s "plain, well-meaning soul" (II.i.128) are obvious. Shakespeare's extensive use of Gower, also Anon's most important source, increases the likelihood that he wrote both plays.²⁰

The T Index

Jackson is right about the T index for *When You See Me*. The relatively high figure for *1 Richard II* which we also agree on (8.26, 8.6, allowing for variables), reflects the textual reworkings discussed by Partridge—*does* for *doth*, *has* for *hath*, *thee*, etc., for *ye*, etc. These data strengthen the stratification theory.

Hendiadys

Do I understand hendiadys? We can compare my published definition with the *OED*, an authority Jackson accepts. Egan: "A rhetorical form in which two dissimilar adjectives, verbs or substantives (as opposed to paired synonyms) are disconcertingly coupled to achieve a conscious semantic purpose."²¹ *OED*: "A figure of speech in which a single complex idea is expressed by two words connected by a conjunction; e.g. by two substantives with *and* instead of an adjective and substantive." So that settles that.

Second, do we find examples in the play "that clearly qualify as true hendiadys"? In other words, to follow the *OED*, are there any figures of speech "in which a single complex idea is expressed by two words connected by a conjunction; e.g. by two substantives with *and* instead of an adjective and substantive"?

Absolutely, yes. In my essay I cite no fewer than 19 instances, typical of Shakespeare, untypical of Rowley. The list includes 'to see / And shun those stains that blurs his majesty' (I.i.190-1), 'You must observe and fashion to the time' (I.ii.37), 'Of this remiss and inconsiderate dealing,' (I.iii.224), 'I never saw you hatch'd and gilded thus' (I.iii.78), 'Mount and curvet like strong Bucephalus' (I.iii.91), 'The battle full of dread and doubtful fear' (II.i.72), 'A victory most strange and admirable' (II.i.84), 'Woodstock and Gaunt are stern and troublesome' (II.i.124), 'And every hour with rude and bitter taunts' (II.i.130), 'The news to all will be most wish'd and welcome' (II.i.154), 'A soldier and a faithful councilor,' (II.ii.160), 'Thou'dst rid mine age of mickle care and woe' (II.ii.199), 'And suit themselves in wild and antic habits' (II.iii.91), 'In state and fashion without difference' (III.ii.42), 'Others there be refuse and murmur strongly' (III.ii.81), 'in operation and quality different' (III.ii.205), 'All rich and rare' (IV.i.52), 'We heard the people midst their joy and moan' (IV.ii.113), 'So full of dread and lordly majesty' (V.i.20).

Jackson needs to explain why none of these qualify as hendiadys or even "couplings of a Shakespearean kind," a formulation I'd accept. After all, "absonant and harsh," in the passage

from *Double Falsehood* cited earlier, is in his opinion “of the Shakespearean kind, coupling the rare Latinism with the plain English adjective.”²² But “Mount and curvet” in the above series from *I Richard II* (to take only one instance), with its coupling of a rare Latinism with a plain English adjective, somehow is not Shakespearean.

I submit that Jackson’s “evidence and its interpretation” varies according to the needs of his case, a point I’ve made before. In 2003 he published a book dating *I Richard II* to the early 1590s, i.e., well after his original essay assigning the play to 1609.²³ He seemed unaware of the contradiction. In the present instance he’s concerned to defend his Rowleyan hypothesis (or more correctly, delegitimize the case for Shakespeare) and so refuses to acknowledge what in another context he affirms, a rare Latinism joined to a plain English adjective.

One might add that Shakespeare used the rare Latinism “curvet” at least twice again in a similar hendiadist fashion, meaning and even context: “The bound and high curvet/Of Mars’s fiery steed,” (*All’s Well that Ends Well*, II.iii.299), and “Anon he rears upright, curvets and leaps,” (*Venus and Adonis*, 279). The evidence just keeps piling up.

Ants Oras

The centerpiece of Jackson’s attack on me is his claim that I have “no firm grasp” of Ants Oras’s *Pause Patterns in Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama: An Experiment in Prosody* (1941). It’s important for Jackson to create this impression because his own analysis of *I Richard II* depends on Oras. If Oras is wrong then so is he, and since I raise so many questions about Oras’s methods and conclusions—for details I refer the reader to “Slurs, Nasal Rhymes and Amputations”—Jackson must respond or quit the field. What’s striking is that instead of answering the very real objections I raise, he focuses on a couple of minor points. Even then he’s wrong.

Jackson’s first charge is that, contrary to what I think, Oras does not use the terms “masculine” and “feminine” to describe strong and weak punctuation.

This one is dealt with easily. “Strong pauses,” Oras notes by way of definition, “are pauses shown by punctuation marks other than commas.” So that would be periods, colons and semicolons, dashes, virgules and exclamation points, with the excluded commas indicating weak pauses.²⁴ Later this taxonomy is gendered:

Feminine pauses with the opportunities they afford for suggesting unobtrusive grace contributes to that air of effortless ease which Shakespeare seems to be deliberately seeking, and certainly soon achieves, in his earlier work. From *Hamlet* to *Macbeth* the experiences he conveys are altogether more massive and disturbing, demanding more vigorous means of expression—such as, among other things, the masculine pauses, which he now increasingly uses. After *Macbeth* the tide of emotion recedes and the sharp emphases subside.²⁵

Elsewhere Oras refers to “patterns of strong pauses” (p. 7), “a strong masculine pause,” (p. 16), and “feminine pauses,” (p. 23). Yet “Oras never misuses the terms ‘feminine’ and ‘masculine’ in this way,” Jackson remarks, in the face of the plain evidence.

Either way, it’s a small point since Oras’s conventionally sexist language was, as I note in passing, merely the jargon of his day. It has no bearing on the validity or otherwise of his argument.²⁶

Jackson’s second canard is even easier to refute. He says I don’t understand that Oras’s A-type pauses within verse lines “include all pauses marked by any punctuation or a change of speakers.”

But here’s what I actually say by way of introducing Oras’s ideas:

Oras was interested principally in pausation, that is, the rhythmic silences between words in blank-verse iambic pentameters. Working his way through hundreds of early modern English plays, including most but not all of Shakespeare, he counted pauses indicated by (a) any punctuation mark, (b) punctuation marks other than commas, and (c) the points at which iambic pentameters were split between two speakers. He called these A-Patterns, B-Patterns and C-Patterns, noting “in what positions they appear in the verse, and in what ratios compared with other positions in the line.”²⁷

The active paraphrase is “(a) any punctuation mark.” This would of course include B- and C-pauses. How this differs from Jackson’s own formulation defeats me.

Corbin and Sedge

Contrary to Jackson’s claim, Corbin and Sedge’s edition (2002) is not the most recent by about five years, and Jackson knows it. Why does he think he can get away with such disingenuousness? Nor is Corbin and Sedge’s any more reliable than Rossiter’s flawed version, as I show in my “Short History of the Text.”²⁸

Jackson adds that “Egan implies that there is something improper” about using Corbin and Sedge. I don’t imply, I say flat out that he resorts to their edition because it far outstrips all others in creating split lines, thus inflating his count of Oras’s so-called C-pauses.

I again invite Jackson to use my text, unless he has scholarly reasons not to. It is in the fact the most recent, more accurate than any preceding because uniquely based on a digitised copy of the original manuscript. It resolves a number of long-standing editorial debates, supported by a wealth of ancillary material.²⁹

The only editors who do not “step” sequent speeches are Frijlinck, whose literal text I don’t count in this context, and Halliwell, whose 1870 edition (the play’s first) also holds close to the original. All other versions, including mine, “step” to some degree, though none to the extent of Corbin and Sedge. My point is that had Jackson referenced any other version his statistical results would be very different and his argument weaker. What I think is truly improper is his failure to tell his readers so.

An “epic caesura” is a trochaic pause followed by an iambic foot. Jackson, following Oras, conjures them into existence at II.ii.143-4 and III.ii.98-9 so as to justify eliminating rhythmically disruptive syllables. This too is scholastically improper.

Jackson’s comment concerning “experienced students of prosody” who would assuredly agree with him is simply arrogant. To date he is the only one to report such results.

Speech-Pause Rhymes

Jackson complains that I make heavy weather of his discussion of *I Richard II*’s verse. I hope so, and note that his boat is rocked.

My objections to his analysis of the play’s poetry have nothing to do with Frederic W. Ness’s definition of “speech-pause” rhyme and Jackson’s account of it, both of which (I readily concede) are perfectly clear. I also don’t dispute Jackson’s claim that *Pericles* and *Timon* are probably collaborative, and that George Wilkins and Thomas Middleton respectively may well be responsible for the speech-pause rhymes he and Vickers identify in these plays.

The crux is whether, as Jackson puts it, “the number of lines of speech-pause rhyme in *Woodstock/I Richard II* (112) far exceeds that in *Timon* (20, at least 16 of which are Middleton’s).” The short answer is that they don’t.

Once again Jackson’s improbable numbers (in this case 112 speech-pause rhymes, a total un-

matched by Middleton and Wilkins combined) depend on definitions, their selective application and of course Jackson's unique ability to know where to find them ("within speeches but preceded and followed by at least one full line of blank verse by the same speaker, except when the closing couplet of a speech is followed by a single blank verse line"³⁰).

In other words, Jackson first looks for such an arrangement and then "discovers" the hidden rhymes concealed within. Contrary to the play's actual rhymes, e.g., *bold-gold; praise-prize; redress-stress; prize-enemies; ire-fire; indeed-bleed; attend-end; crown-drown; go-woe; spilt-guilt; nigh-fly; good-blood; sport-for't; him-him; me-see*, etc., none of which Jackson recognizes, Sam Rowley was "really" concerned to create a network of opaque "nasal assonantal rhymes," including *queen-realm, Green-room, undone-harm, come-wrongs, again-king, and Maine-arm*.

In "Slurs, Nasal Rhymes and Amputations" I show how arbitrary Jackson's impositions are. I'll take the example he uses to refute me, *him* and *again*, which he "nasally and assonantly" rhymes while waxing satirical about my observation that in this passage *again* and *uncertain* are the likelier pair.

Her speech is gone. Only at sight of him
She heav'd her hands and clos'd her eyes again,
And whether alive or dead is yet uncertain.

I Richard II, IV.iii.106-7

Assuming a rhyme is intended here—slant, half, near or off—it's surely not *him* and *again*. "Eyes again/uncertain" makes better poetic sense. As Jackson himself might say, if he cannot see or hear it I can't help him.

And of course I don't believe half-rhymes are the same as full rhymes, nor do I think that "near-rhymes demand to be spoken as exact rhymes." But near- or half-rhymes are not the same as "nasal" rhymes for which there must be some phonic accommodation, assuming the author's intent, or what's the point? How does one nasally pronounce *him* so that it suggests an aural connection with *again* and still avoid an adenoidal farce?

As for Jackson's exclusion of the collaborative *Pericles* and *Timon* while including the collaborative *I Henry VI, The Two Noble Kinsmen, and Henry VIII*, I don't really care. It doesn't affect the outcome of my general critique though it does again show the extent to which Jackson is willing to play with his data base.

Notes

¹ Jackson, 'The Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' pp. 68-9.

² Jackson, 'The Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 73.

³ Jackson, 'The Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 78.

⁴ Wilhelmina P. Frijlinck: *The First Part of the Reign of King Richard the Second or Thomas of Woodstock* (London: Printed for the Malone Society by J. Johnson at the Oxford University Press, 1929).

⁵ Partridge, pp. 38-9 and *passim*.

⁶ Elliott and Valenza are notoriously unreliable. Their analyses are shot through with malpractice and questionable procedures, as Richard Whalen and John Shahan (among many others) have repeatedly shown in the pages of this journal and elsewhere. It's also not true that Elliott and Valenza "show that plays of the acknowledged Shakespeare canon 'pass' nearly all their tests for Shakespeare." Quite a few plays, especially the earlier ones, are ruled out or assigned "doubtful" status.

⁷ Brean Hammond (ed.): *DoubleFalsehood* (Arden Shakespeare, Methuen 2010), p. 160.

⁸ Brean Hammond (ed.): *DoubleFalsehood* (Arden Shakespeare, Methuen 2010), p. 160.

⁹ Egan, *The Tragedy of Richard II, Part One, 'Commentary'*, Vol. III, pp. 264-278.

- ¹⁰ Jackson, ‘Shakespeare’s *Richard II* and the Anonymous *Thomas of Woodstock*,’ p. 57.
- ¹¹ Egan, “The Dramatist as Historian,” *The Tragedy of Richard II, Part One*, pp. 176-206.
- ¹² Holinshed, *Chronicles* Vol. II, p. 784.
- ¹³ Holinshed, *Chronicles* Vol. II, p. 784.
- ¹⁴ Holinshed, *Chronicles* Vol. II, p. 784.
- ¹⁵ Richard H. Jones: *The Royal Policy of Richard II: Absolutism in the Middle Ages* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968) p. 69); E.M. Thompson (ed.): *Chronicon Anglie 1328-1388* (London: Rolls Series, 1874), p.p. 382-3, cited by Saul, *op. cit.*, p. 186, n. 34.
- ¹⁶ Lily B. Campbell (ed.): *The Mirror for Magistrates* (Cambridge U.P., 1938), p. 91.
- ¹⁷ John Hardyng: *The Chronicle of Jhon [sic] Hardyng, from the Firste Begynnynge of Englande, vnto the Reigne of Kyng Edward the Fourth* (London, 1543; STC 12767), sig. A8v.
- ¹⁸ Richard Grafton: *Chronicles of England* ([1590], London: J. Johnson, 1809) Vol. I, p. 468.
- ¹⁹ Wright, *Political Poems and Songs Relating to English History*, pp. 417-454; Eric W. Stockton: *The Major Latin Works of John Gower ‘The Voice of One Crying’ and ‘The Tripartite Chronicle’: An Annotated Translation into English With an Introductory Essay on the Author’s Non-English Works* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1962), *Passus secunda*, 36.
- ²⁰ Egan, *The Tragedy of Richard II, Part One*, Vol. I, pp. 189-95.
- ²¹ Egan, *The Tragedy of Richard II, Part One*, Vol. I, pp. p. 494. I follow this with supporting quotations and illustrations by Frank Kermode and Brian Vickers.
- ²² Macdonald P. Jackson: “Thought-executing fires,” TLS May 21 2010.
- ²³ Egan, *The Tragedy of Richard II, Part One*, p. 131, citing MacD. P. Jackson: *Defining Shakespeare: Pericles as Test Case* (Oxford U.P. 2003), p. 46.
- ²⁴ Oras, p. 3.
- ²⁵ Oras, p. 15.
- ²⁶ “Slurs, Nasal Rhymes and Amputations,” p. 169.
- ²⁷ “Slurs, Nasal Rhymes and Amputations,” p. 169; Oras, p. 2
- ²⁸ Egan, *The Tragedy Richard II, Part One*, Vol. III.
- ²⁹ For example, at V.i.176-7 many editors (including Frijlinck) have Woodstock saying that were he guilty of rebellion he’d submit immediately to the angry king: “I’d lay my neck under the block before him / And willingly endure the stroke of death.” But Keller (1899) noticed that there was something wrong with this—heads about to be removed by the ax are normally laid on and not under blocks. He thus suggested *upon the block* as a possible emendation. Rossiter opted for *unto*, presumably to retain as much of *under* as possible, and successive editors have either followed him, puristically reproduced *under the block*, or chosen some prepositional alternative. My analysis, however, suggests that what’s been mistaken is not the preposition but the noun. *Blocke* is really *blade*. An awkwardly shaped *de* has been taken too readily for *cke*, and the *a*, by extension, for an *o*. If you kern *cke* really tightly, like this: *dæ*, you get something easily mistaken for *de*, and of course vice versa—thus *blade*, and not *blocke*, which makes equally good sense of the line and allows us to retain *under*, about which there can be no disagreement: “I’d lay my neck under the blade before him / And willingly endure the stroke of death.”
- ³⁰ Jackson, ‘Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,’ p. 87.